DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 264 SO 009 678

AUTHOR Wronski, Stanley P.
TITLE UNESCO and the Academic Community: A Case Study.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, D.C., November 4-7, 1976); Not available in hard copy due to poor legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Activism; Administrative Policy; *Case Studies; *Censorship; College Environment; Conflict; *Ethics; Freedom of Speech; Higher Education; International Organizations; Political Attitudes; Political Issues; Politics; *Professors; Social Studies; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Militancy; World Affairs

ABSTRACT

A case study concerning professional ethics and political activism of university professors is presented. The subject of the study is the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, an organization which is pressuring the academic community to boycott all UNESCO-sponsored activities until UNESCO ceases its alleged discriminatory political activities and modifies resolutions condemning Zionism and racism. The intent of the author is to call attention to a situation that has created considerable internal controversy at American universities. The attempts of Committee members to cancel a UNESCO conference at Michigan State University in 1976 are documented, and letters circulated by the Committee concerning this and other university conferences are discussed. The ethical issues dealt with relate to those which surround the UNESCO conference, policy statements issued by the National Council for the Social Studies on academic freedom and open inquiry, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the responsibility of the university to remain a marketplace for the free exchange of ideas. An appendix presents a chronology of 14 events prior and subsequent to the UNESCO-sponsored conference at Michigan State University, May 24 through 29, 1976. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133264

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UNESCO and the Academic Community: A Case Study*

It is perhaps well that we in social studies education have had, over the past several years, considerable discussion concerning inductive and deductive modes of inquiry. In connection with this particular section meeting on "the ethics of our profession" the three of us have had the benefit of an excellent conceptual framework or "advance organizer" prepared by Mike Hartoonian. Both he and Anna Ochoa, using this framework as a point of departure, have proceeded mainly (but not exclusively) in a deductive manner and have addressed themselves to issues that they see as relating to this pre-determined framework. Mike, for example, is mainly concerned with student rights and the purposes of schooling while Anna has concentrated on teacher/author rights and the purposes of schooling.

The third part of our mutual tripartite pact relates to the area of societal rights and the purposes of schooling. I do indeed intend to address myself to this area, but fortunately the chairperson of this session, in a memorandum to the three of us this summer, indicated that "Stan's recent adventures" with a certain international conference may "make it likely that he might deal" with other aspects as well. I do not know whether Bill Joyce did this out of courtesy, institutional favoritism or deference to seniority. But, at any rate, I do appreciate it. This appreciation stems from at least two basic considerations: first, the substance of my presentation is such that it inevitably relates to all three major areas of our conceptual framework; and second, what I have to say is more amenable to an inductive rather than deductive approach.

SP009678

Essentially I am placing before you a case study--with emphasis on the ethical issues that it poses for those of us who are professionally concerned about the social studies. The issues revolve around a conference sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and held on the campus of Michigan State University from May 22-29, 1976. The theme of the conference was

* Address given by Stanley P. Wronski, Professor of Education and Social Science, Michigan State University, at the General Session of the College and University Faculty Associates of the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C. November 4, 1976

"The Role of the Social Studies in Education for Peace and Respect for Human Rights." Both the National Council for the Social Studies and the US. National Commission for UNESCO cooperated with UNESCO in conducting the conference.

The ethical issues involved in the controversy surrounding this conference not only relate to those outlined in our conceptual framework here but also relate to policy statements issued by NCSS on academic freedom and open inquiry into controversial issues. In addition to these issues, there were the further ethical questions that I had to resolve when I was first approached to participate in this session.

Should I publicly bare a situation that has engendered considerable internal controversy in the institution at which I am employed?

To what extent do I describe incidents which may bring embarrassment to some of my professional colleagues?

Do I refer to participants in this controversy by name or anonymously?

Should I, as a participant-observer in this situation, be the one to relate these events, given my own biases and selective interpretation?

My very presence here obviously indicates that I have resolved these questions in my mind. But they still required some agonizing ethical appraisal on my part.

Now for some details about the conference itself, some of the episodes associated with it, and ethical issues raised by these episodes.

An organization called the Committee for and Effective UNESCO has taken the leadership nationally and internationally in apposing UNESCO sponsored conferences on university campuses. The Committee is an extremely powerful pressure group. Included among its sponsors are several Nobel Laureates. It has been successful in spearheading the cancellation or indefinite postponement of UNESCO sponsored conferences at several universities--including Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, the University of California at San Diego, and the University of Texas at Austin. Stated simply, its goals call upon the academic community to boycott all UNESCO sponsored activities--even when such activities involve discussions on matters of common professional concern among competent

colleagues acting as private individuals. Presumably this boycott is to be maintained until UNESCO ceases its politicization and modifies resolutions and other actions which have been judged discriminatory toward one of its Member States.

With that as an introduction I propose to inquire into the consequences, ramifications and ripple effects of actions taken by members of the academic community who subscribe to the general viewpoint espoused by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO. What follows is only a partial listing of various events and consequences centering mainly on those in which I was directly or very closely involved. After each of these I urge you to reflect seriously on this question: Are these the kind of consequences in which the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, or any responsible member of the academic community, can take pride?

1. Acting on behalf of the NCSS and the US National Commission for UNESCO as local organizer of the planned conference at MSU I proceeded to request the assistance of a conference coordinator within our Continuing Education Service, which normally and routinely honors such requests by university personnel. During my eighteen years at MSU I have been involved as either a participant or organizer in numerous campus conferences conducted with the professional logistic support of our Continuing Education Service at Kellogg Center. This time I was denied such assistance. In checking with knowledgeable people about the frequency of such an unusual action, I was told that to the best of their recollection there had <u>never</u> been any such prior denial. Subsequent to this action (which I asked to be reconsidered, but to no avail) and acting on behalf of the NCSS and the US National Commission for UNESCO, I requested that these two organizations be permitted jointly to host the conference and use the conference and hotel facilities at Kellogg Center. This request also was initially denied. As a last resort I wrote a letter of appeal to the President of the University requesting that he reconsider this last action--which was referred to as the final determination of the UNESCO issue on this campus. He agreed to my request to have the conference held at Kellogg Center and agreed that I would act as host and local

organizer in my capacity as a faculty member at MSU. The conference was held as scheduled during the week of May 22-29, 1976

It should be pointed out that MSU has earned a national and international reputation for the thousands of conferences and extension-type educational services carried on in its Kellogg Center. Allof this makes the action taken with respect to the UNESCO conference even more remarkable. As an aside I should also like to offer the opinion that, under similar circumstances in the future, MSU will reaffirm its long-honored and traditional policy of permitting--even encouraging--its faculty members to utilize its Continuing Education Service to pursue legitimate professional interests. It has become obvious to faculty members who are knowledgeable about the circumstances surrounding the UNESCO conference that if faculty member A can have conference logistic support denied because of opposition to the political and/or educational views of a sponsoring organization X, then member B can be similarly treated with respect to organization Y, and so forth.

2. As of the time of this writing (October, 1976). The Committee for an Effective UNESCO continues to list this conference under a heading entitled: "List of Known University Cancellations of UNESCO Sponsored Meetings." In a letter of August 13, 1976 from Ms. Ruth Levine, the Executive Staff Consultant of the Committee for an Effective UNESCO addressed to Dr. Howard Mehlinger, NCSS President-Elect and chairman of the conference, this error is compounded by stating that "Michigan State University did withdraw sponsorship" of the conference (italics hers). As the local organizer and host of the conference I can assure you that at no time was Michigan State University invited by UNESCO to be a sponsor of the conference. How then could it withdraw a non-existent sponsorship? From the inception of the conference plans in 1974 the official sponsor was and continued to be the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and the National Council for the Social Studies cooperated with UNESCO in organizing and conducting the conference.

Let me highlight specifically one set of insidious consequences associated with

the use of the Committee for an Effective UNESCO list of "known university cancellations." Shortly after it became a matter of record that UNESCO had been invited to hold its meeting at MSU, there was a meeting of the all-university advisory committee on international activities. One faculty member, who had previously stated his opposition to the planned conference on campus made a rather lengthy oral presentation to the committee. In the course of his remarks to the committee he stated categorically that similar UNESCO sponsored conferences scheduled at the University of California at San Diego and at the University of Texas in Austin were, as of that date (October 30, 1975), cancelled. I was the only one at the meeting who challenged the accuracy of this statement, and upon further questioning from other committee members, he modified his position to say that they were "in the process of being cancelled." Whereupon another member of the committee asked whether that couldn't be interpreted in such a way that they were discussing the pros and cons of the issue "in the same manner as we are doing at MSU." His response, in essence, was yes, I guess you can say that. In fairness to him he even had a statement issued to committee members which pointed out that the two conferences referred to had in fact not been cancelled as of that date. I mention this episode to raise the nagging question: What would have happened had the initial erroneous statement not been challenged? An even more disturbing question is this: What message and image is conveyed to a person who hears that such and such a conference is "in the process of being cancelled"?

Now are you ready for the clincher? Two months later (in December, 1975) the two conferences were indeed cancelled. I shall leave it to the objective listener to infer to what extent such a bandwagon device was a factor in these and other cancellations. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO has certainly devised an ingenious and powerful propaganda device. The listener also is invited to ascribe a label to this device and reflect upon historical parallels involving its use.

Lest you think this is an isolated and overly dramatized case of the insidious

use of this list, let me briefly relate another incident in which I was directly involved.

At the annual meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO held in December, 1975 a member of the Commission delivered some rather critical comments on UNESCO. He argued that other scientists, like himself, were becoming disenchanted with UNESCO because, among other reasons, it had violated the scholarly canons of scientific universality and objectivity. In support of his argument he pointed out that some prestigious universities, including the one at which he was a professor, had cancelled UNESCO sponsored conferences. He concluded his remarks by saying that he had in his hands a list of three other universities (not identified) that were "in the process of cancelling" such conferences.

During the course of this meeting I approached this individual and asked if he would inform me as to what three universities were on his list. One was Michigan State University. When I inquired as to the source of his information he assured me that it was a highly reliable one. Upon identifying myself as the local organizer of the conference I assured him that in no way was the conference cancelled and that discussions about it were proceeding probably in the same manner as on the other campuses.

Again I leave it to the listener to draw an inference as to the most likely source of this person's information that MSU was "in the process of cancelling" the conference. Suffice it to say that he did not withdraw or retract his previous statement. Please keep in mind that this took place approximately six months prior to the actual holding of the conference.

3. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO and those who subscribe to its point of view have contributed an incremental but highly significant imbalance to whatever parity may have existed on given campuses involving the relative weight of university administrators and faculty in the decision-making process. To illuminate this point I need first to place before you a typical scenario of events leading up to the decision to cancel or indefinitely postpone a UNESCO sponsored conference. It goes somewhat as

as follows: An individual faculty member or group of members in a specialized academic area request that their university be the site of the conference. A powerful inducement is the rare opportunity to engage in professional discourse with their academic counterparts in other countries of the world. It should be stressed that in most such conferences (such as the one held at MSU) the delegates speak as private citizens who share a common professional interest in a given academic area.

Now what, in fact, has taken place in those instances involving cancellation or indefinite postponement? Frequently, it has been a reaffirmation of the outmoded administrative principle whereby the faculty proposes and the administration disposes. Although I am aware of this practice having taken place on other campuses, let me again cite the situation at MSU as an illustration.

We have four professors, in addition to myself, whose major teaching, research and writing responsibilities are in the area of social studies education. All four supported the idea of holding the proposed UNESCO conference on the role of the social studies on this campus with the usual kind of Continuing Education Service logistic support. Three of these also wrote a memorandum to the President of the University conveying their "strong support" of the conference. All three have national reputations in their field, have published extensively and have been on the program of several annual meetings of the National Council for the Social Studies, One is currently the editor of the elementary education section of Social Education and Chairperson of the College and University Faculty Associates of the NCSS. Even with such overwhelming support from those faculty members whose professional competence encompassed the topic of the conference, the decision was made to deny the request to use the Continuing Education Service facilities.

The central point remains. The conference at MSU came perilously close to being cancelled and similar conferences at other universities have been cancelled by administrative decisions made contrary to the requests and recommendations of faculty members who are most knowledgeable about the academic area on which the conference

focuses.

4. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO has itself exhibited unscholarly conduct and lack of objectivity--the very kinds of defects it has attributed to UNESCO. The erroneous references to "known cancellation" of the MSU conference are only one category of such instances. I cite also the use of a list of organizations which the Committee refers to as "List of known protests and resolutions condemning UNESCO politicalization by American learned societies and professional organizations." The implication of this list is clear. On the MSU campus it was used to convey the notion that these organizations, and presumably the majority of their membership, endorse in principle the idea of boycotting UNESCO related activities. The American Sociological Association, of which I am a member, is included in this list. But the Committee fails to point out that after the ASA passed its resolution on UNESCO at an open business meeting, its Council (the governing body) subsequently voted to accept the invitation of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to appoint a representative from the ASA to membership on the Commission. Now the question arises: Which action truly reflects the feelings and opinion of the ASA membership on the issue of boycotting UNESCO related activities? Surely an impartial and objective reading of these actions would indicate a substantial difference of opinion on this issue.

5. In arguing against the politicization of UNESCO, the Committee for an Effective UNESCO and its adherents have proposed courses of action that are in themselves highly detrimental to the cause of academic freedom.

Perhaps the most frequently voiced criticism leveled against UNESCO and its sponsored conferences is that they have become politicized to such an extent that no self-respecting scholar should have anything to do with either until they mend their ways. This position has been prominently disseminated and supported by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO. Putting aside for the moment the extremely complex semantic problem of determining what constitutes politicization, let me relate some of the

actual consequences on the campus of MSU emanating from the use of this line of reasoning by those who opposed the holding of the conference here.

An all-university advisory committee on international affairs spent over two and one-half hours discussing the pros and cons of permitting the conference to be held. A major argument of the opposition revolved about the issue of politicization. I should add parenthetically that the meeting took place a few days after the United Nations General Assembly had passed its resolution relating to racism and Zionism, and many of the committee members expressed genuine concern that the planned UNESCO conference might take equally odious actions. The recommendation finally voted on (by a one vote majority) was astonishing.

The adopted motion stated that the committee "wishes to support the hosting of the conference if the conference agenda were to include, and focus upon, the reconsideration of the UNESCO resolutions against Israel's membership, or the membership of any other country, in UNESCO on a regional basis as well as at the general level." This motion, in substance, insisted that the meeting become politicized.

As a social studies teacher I could not help wondering how each of these faculty members (whose academic interests ranged from animal husbandry to zoology but none of whom were in social studies education) might have reacted had he or she been the initiator of a professional conference and then was confronted with a mandate for interjecting extraneous and highly volatile political issues into the agenda as a pre-condition for holding the conference. It was a frightening specter. Again, in fairness to a high level administrator present, he reminded the committee members that their motion was advisory only and that the University would have to give serious consideration to any proposal for cancelling any scheduled conference because it may have political overtones.

Another use to which the politicization argument was put on the MSU campus is more comprehendable, but even more damaging to any academic environment. It is, in effect, 180 degrees removed from the above motion. According to this argument a

university should be given adequate assurances that any planned UNESCO conference would not become politicized before it gives permission to have it held. A request from MSU for such an assurance was conveyed to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, one of the two organizations formally cooperating with the sponsor of the conference. A letter of response from one of the Commission staff members pointed out the difficulty of giving an ironclad guarantee for this or any other conference. He raised the question, for example, of who can predict with certainty what any delegate, acting as a private citizen, may say in the heat of professional dialogue? He also pointed out, however, that the chairperson of such a conference is traditionally the delegate from the host country. This person would be in a position, by using proper parliamentary procedures, to forestally or lessen the impact of such politicization. This response was deemed to be inadequate and not satisfactory by an MSU administrator who was opposed to having the conference held.

Consider the implications of such an opposing stance: It is prejudicial in the literal sense. A pre-judgment about the conference participants has already been made. These private scholars--our counterparts throughout the world--are presumed to have lost whatever scholarly integrity and objectivity they possess when they leave their countries and set foot on the soil of an American university. How demeaning can we be?

As for politicization of the conference held at MSU, I can only report that not one person--official delegate, invited guest, or observer--voiced to me nor, to my knowledge, to anyone else the slightest criticism to the effect that it was politicized. But you do not have to take my word for this. I gladly offer to join with the Committee for An Effective UNESCO in the appointment of an impartial jury of scholars who can sit in judgment as they listen to the taped recordings of all proceedings.

The demeaning nature of a pre-judgmental position extends not only to our foreign colleagues. By actively engaging in a campaign to prohibit the holding of such conferences on American campuses the adherents of this position are practicing a form of pre-censorship that violates both the spirit and the letter of the First Amendment to

our own Constitution. In the development of American constitutional law there has emerged the principle of "clear and present danger" as a necessary condition for denial of the rights to free speech. The opinion of some individuals that there may be danger or even the possibility of such danger are not sufficient cause for pre-censorship. Did the holding of a conference at MSU on the role of the social studies in education for peace and respect for human rights constitute such a clear and present danger? Demonstrably not. Is it likely that the holding of similar conferences (e.g., on the fine arts or lifelong education) meets the criterion of clear and present danger? Let the impartial listener judge.

An especially regrettable consequence of such pre-censorship is the image of the American academic community that is conveyed to our world-wide colleagues. They are not so naive that they fail to see the contradiction between our professions of constitutional faith and our actions. Can we take pride in this? This pre-judgmental position taken by the Committee for an Effective UNESCO has already been successful in building a soundproof wall around the campuses of several universities in the United States. A logical extension of this communications boycott is the building of a similar wall around the entire American academic community.

Another vignette on the topic of politicization. In an effort (later proven to be fruitless) to effect some kind of compromise on the issues surrounding the holding of the conference, a third party suggested that I meet with one of the faculty members who was a leader of the opposition. Incidentally, this is a person who also wrote one one letter to the University President opposing the conference and a second letter to President Ford recommending that the United States withdraw not only from UNESCO but also from the UN. At any rate, near the end of an approximately two-hour meeting I posed this question to him: "Are you saying that what you are proposing is the academic equivalent of a pre-emptive military strike?" His answer was an emphatic, "Yes."

It has come full circle. What the Committee for an Effective UNESCO is effectively

advocating is this: In the name of opposing politicization of a world academic community it is proposing politicization of selected members of the American academic community. It is aiding and abetting academic balkanization.

6. The final episode I should like to relate has a happy ending. I use the term "happy" in much the same way that a father may refer to being happy that he is safely home after a long auto trip with his wife and family--but he still vividly recalls the on-coming car that crossed over to his lane and almost succeeded in driving him into a ditch. Let me explain.

About six weeks before the scheduled UNESCO conference convened and after the university president had given the go-ahead signal, I met with personnel from the MSU educational television station, described the nature of the conference, and also informed them that there had been an appreciable amount of opposition on campus to the holding of the conference. I asked if they would be interested in videotaping some rather extended portions of the meeting. These videotapes were then to be edited for a one-hour documentary. Such a documentary, we agreed, would be a worthwhile permanent record, could be used for pre-service and in-service training of social studies teachers, could be shown at professional meetings, and could very possibly have appeal to the viewers of educational television in the United States and abroad. I obtained assurances of funding for such a project from the Longview Foundation in Washington, D.C. and the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education at Indiana University.

As the time approached for editing the documentary I was informed by university administrators that I should not convey anything in the documentary which would identify the conference as having been held on the campus of Michigan State University. It was suggested that, if I wanted to refer to the locale, it should be "in East Lansing" rather than "at Michigan State University." I was astonished. We are all familiar enough with the First Amendment to know that any news media can report on any past event provided they observe the usual journalistic amenities with respect to libel, national security, incitement to riot, and the like.

My astonishment over such a restriction was exceeded only by my dismay over the reason given. In effect I was told that the university must be careful of the uses to which some persons or organizations, such as the Committee for an Effective UNESCO, might put the information that a UNESCO sponsored conference was held on its campus. I could not help thinking, "Since when should this, or any other university permit the pressures of a private special interest group to take precedence over the First Amendment?"

Now for the happy ending. Before the documentary was completed the University modified this directive. But for the purposes of this presentation the most frightening observation to be drawn from this incident is that it should ever have occurred at all.

Not frightening, but more poignant, is another incident within the whole videotape episode. In addition to on-the-spot taping of conference sessions at Kellogg Center, the producer of the documentary, near the end of the conference, taped a 45-minute program of informal conversations among selected conference participants in the recording studio of the television station. The purpose of the studio taping was to provide additional material to be eventually worked into the final documentary. This unrehearsed conversation session consisted of three conference delegates plus myself as a combination host and moderator. The exchange was free and unrestrained. As the program was approaching the end, one of the participants (the delegate from the Soviet Union, a member of the Academy of Pedagogical Science) asked in an impromptu manner if she could extend a few words of greetings since she was informed that the program possibly would be aired on educational television channels in Michigan and elsewhere. The essence of her brief remark was that she was very happy and pleased to be attending the conference, she was delighted with the hospitality that the various faculty members and others had accorded her, and she wanted to extend her sincere thanks and appreciation "to the students, faculty and all other persons at Michigan State University."

It was only later, after I had been initially informed about the restrictions on divulging the locale of the conference, that the pathetic irony of such a directive became fully apparent. Here was a warm and spontaneous extension of the hand of friendship in keeping with the spirit and theme of the conference. Yet, at the time of the editing of the documentary, I was operating under a directive that required the rejection and deletion of this message.

Permit me to conclude with a semi-personal observation. As an educator who has spent over half his life in the academic community it grieves me to recount events and incidents which do not always reflect favorably on my professional colleagues, whether at Michigan State University or elsewhere. It grieves me even more, however, to reflect on those searing words of John Donne.

But as with many such cases involving professional decision making, there emerges at least one outstanding act of academic courage. The record should boldly and proudly show that, in the final test, President Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. of Michigan State University gave decisive consent to the holding of a UNESCO sponsored conference on the MSU campus. In doing so he, unlike his counterpart in several other prestigious institutions, reaffirmed a cardinal ethical principle of all higher education--that a university is a marketplace for the free and responsible exchange of ideas.

Stanley P. Wronski
Professor of Education and Social Science
Michigan State University

October 1, 1976

Chronology of Events Prior and Subsequent to
UNESCO Sponsored Conference Held at
Michigan State University, May 23-29, 1976

(Prepared by Stanley P. Wronski, Professor of Education
and Social Science, Michigan State University)

1. In December, 1974 I attended the annual meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO after having been appointed to the Commission early in 1974. While at the meeting, I was informed by a member of the Commission staff that UNESCO was planning to hold an international conference on "The role of the social studies in education for peace and respect for human rights." As the current president of the National Council for the Social Studies and a member of the MSU Institute for International Studies in Education I expressed an interest in finding out more about the planned conference.

2. After several informal conversations, letters and telephone calls with the staff of the U.S. National Commission in Washington, D.C., I inquired about the possibility of holding the proposed conference at MSU.

3. At the suggestion of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO I also approached officers within the National Council for the Social Studies to inquire if they would be interested in being involved in the conference. I reported on the possibility of such a conference to the Board of Directors of the NCSS in May, 1975. Since there was no certainty at that time as to what country would host the conference, the report was primarily informational and did not require any formal action on the part of the Board. By unanimous consent it concurred with my request to pursue the matter further on behalf of the NCSS. At that time I also informed the Board that no NCSS funds were being requested in connection with the conference because I had received assurances from MSU that it would cover the necessary costs (estimated at approximately $2000.00) associated with hosting the conference. (This assurance was later withdrawn by MSU.)

4. After several weeks of receiving no news during the summer of 1975 I received a copy of a cablegram sent by the U.S. National Commission to UNESCO headquarters in Paris. It contained a request to have the proposed conference held at MSU in May, 1976. The conference was to be hosted by MSU "in cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies and the U.S. National Commission."

5. UNESCO approved the request on August 25, 1975 and included the list of fifteen countries to be invited.

6. In October, 1975 Mr. Ryon Kwan Kim, Program Specialist for the Section of Education for International Cooperation and Peace, UNESCO, met with personnel from the U.S. National Commission and the NCSS to make preliminary arrangements for the conference and discuss its

provisional agenda. Mr. Kim then spent two days on the MSU campus meeting with various faculty members and with President Wharton.

7. At the NCSS Board of Directors meeting in November, 1975 I reported more fully on the planned conference. The Board unanimously voted continued support for holding the conference. I also reported to the NCSS International Activities Committee and it passed a motion by a vote of 9-1 in support of NCSS cooperation with the conference.

8. Beginning in the Fall, 1975 several faculty members at MSU voiced strong objections to having a UNESCO sponsored conference on the MSU campus. The University withdrew its offer to host the conference in February, 1975. I requested permission to hold the conference as originally planned at the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education on the MSU campus but without any official University hosting or funds. The hosting functions were to be taken over by the U.S. National Commission and the NCSS. This request was initially denied by MSU.

9. After writing a letter to President Wharton of MSU requesting that he reconsider the above decision, I received a reply from him on March 15, 1976 permitting the conference to be held at Kellogg Center with the U.S. National Commission and the NCSS as hosts.

10. At its meeting held in May, 1976 the NCSS Board of Directors approved my request for approximately $1200 to defray anticipated expenses incurred in hosting the conference.

11. The conference was held at Kellogg Center during the week of May 23-29, 1976. Fourteen of the fifteen invited countries sent a delegate. The official delegate from the United States was Howard Mehlinger, currently the President-elect of the NCSS. Dr. Mehlinger was subsequently elected chairman of the conference. Each delegate was selected by the National Commission for UNESCO of the respective country and attended the conference as a private individual, not as an official representative of his or her country.

12. In August, 1976 the Committee for an Effective UNESCO continued to distribute an information sheet entitled, "List of known University cancellations of UNESCO sponsored conferences." Michigan State University remains on that list. The Committee for an Effective UNESCO has taken the leadership in bringing about cancellations or indefinite postponement of several UNESCO sponsored conferences at various American universities.

13. Because the attempted cancellation of the conference at MSU and the actual cancellation of other such conferences raises fundamental issues relating to academic freedom and open inquiry into controversial topics, I have prepared a lengthy statement describing several disturbing occurrences that have taken place before and after the MSU conference. I have written this statement in the form of an open letter to the Committee for and Effective UNESCO and have incorporated it in my report on the MSU conference to the Executive Director of NCSS.